DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 231 CG 004 535

AUTHOR Graham, James M.
TITLE Prospectus for an Assistance Center for Community and Junior College Students.
INSTITUTION National Student Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 10 Jun 69
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.10
DESCRIPTORS *Activism, Communication (Thought Transfer), *Junior Colleges, *Student Characteristics, *Student Leadership, *Student Organizations, Student Problems

ABSTRACT

After meeting with two junior college administration and student groups, the problems of junior college unrest and dissatisfaction became more evident to the author. Several aspects of junior colleges must be considered: (1) junior college students are unique in their diversity of background and motivation, (2) the community is vitally a part of the junior college and can exert control over it, (3) many junior college students accept the addition of the college experience which may not materially alter what he did before college, and (4) as four year universities become more selective, many students attending two-year colleges will do so because they are unable to enter four year institutions, which could result in a serious conflict of status and self perception. At the junior college level, the student government remains little more than a continuation of its counterpart in high school. Yet student government is the main route for student-administrative communication which could dispell serious conflict and disruption. (Author/KJ)

ED034231

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROSPECTUS

FOR

AN ASSISTANCE CENTER

FOR

COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

June 10, 1969

Submitted by:

U.S. National Student Association
2115 'S' Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008
202/387-5100

James M. Graham
Vice President

CG004535

CG004535

"The concerns and needs for the two-year student association are sufficiently unique as to warrant a separate department in U.S.N.S.A. In fact, they are so unique that the existing facilities do not serve the junior college needs."

Mr. Larry Mudd
St. Catherine Junior College

"I believe that student government in two-year institutions can only benefit from an affiliation with (NSA)...There remains the practical question of how best to proceed."

Dr. Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
President, Northampton County Area
Community College

"There is a definite need for some cooperation between junior college programs throughout our nation. Student government leaders need some means of communicating with others to improve upon their own programs."

Mr. Tommy Ed Fielder
President, Freshman Class
Paducah Community College

"There are other obvious problems, such as only two years to develop student leadership -- which is only another good reason why leadership at the national level that can be a continuing leadership is necessary."

Dr. Terry O'Banion
Assistant Professor of Higher Education
University of Illinois

"Yes, I do favor national and regional meetings of student governments at two-year colleges...(as) it has created a better dialogue between students, faculty, and administration...through this stability we can help solve some of our present student uprising(s)..."

Mr. Ronald Blumenberg
Student Chairman
Chicago City College

"The Community College atmosphere seems to me very reminiscent of the 50's: orientation to a secure position (preferably well paying) is evident and in most cases is an unrealistic goal brought on by pushy parents who want to be upwardly mobile, but are not; no fully developed social conscience in a time when this world view is almost universal; an innate, almost unshakable, conservatism -- not the variety which gets things done on time and effectively, but the type that looks smooth -- straight arrow, if you will, -- and expects that look of effectiveness to do the job."

Mr. Gary Christensen
Instructor
Macomb County Community College

INTRODUCTION

Like most institutions, NSA in its twenty-two year history has paid little or no attention to the junior college. Two-year student governments came and went while NSA programs and services continued to be directed to the needs of the "university" student association. Occasionally, no doubt, those programs benefited the junior college memberships. Despite two resolutions passed in 1957, there has never been any membership drive or any specific program conducted for the two-year institution.

Today, 16 of the 400 member student governments are at junior colleges. In some ways it is surprising that there are that many. At the XXI National Student Congress (August, 1968), a solitary community college sent representatives, while over 350 four-year institutions were in attendance.

My interest in the junior college came after being a resource person at the Vincennes Conference on Student Rights at the Two Year Institution (sponsored by the American Association of Junior Colleges) in December of last year. I attended reluctantly...all I knew about junior college students were personal acquaintances who had attended "such schools"...the not too bright, the not too motivated, and the not too affluent. The joint administration - student meeting lasted two days, consisted mainly of discussions of student "responsibility" (the word "rights" was avoided), and ended with a poll of the voting delegates on the various areas in which students might have "responsibilities." In the tightly structured meetings, I found the conservatism of certain professionals was more than rivaled by that of many of the students. Throughout even the most informal discussions, I felt considerable tension and uneasiness in the meeting, as though the two groups had never talked before. Both groups claimed that they certainly did not want a "Columbia" at their school, but they didn't verbalize how they could avoid such an occurrence, except for a vague notion of "participation."

Throughout the weekend, I was hoping that the two groups would move to a "first name basis." It never happened. Anyone who looked the part became "doctor," and the younger delegates remained on a "first name basis." The one-way use of titles was the first barrier. Some students were perceptibly quiet in the presence of the administrators, only to burst into conversations when they left. For many students (and no doubt for as many administrators), the meetings were the first struggling step toward understanding. As the meeting closed, there was a noticeable sense of relief. The students particularly indicated their interest in future meetings, as this was the first time for many of them that they had met with other students outside their state (or even their school).

This meeting was my first recognition of the significant differences between the two- and four-year academic experience. I saw students and professionals who together were beginning to come to grips with at least the issues, if not the basic questions, of student unrest. I noticed that the students, while eager and intelligent, had difficulty in verbalizing their concerns and frustrations and were almost incapable of suggesting what types of steps the college might take to meet their needs. It took my wife and I some time to overcome the feeling that we were "outside agitators."

While at the conference, students and administrators indicated that they wanted to know more about NSA. I was encouraged to find ways in which the Association might become more relevant to the junior college. Upon returning to Washington I wrote a little paper on what NSA might be able to do, and began a correspondence with students and administrators to see how they felt about NSA getting involved. The responses, without exception, were positive. I began working out a finalized draft with Dr. John Orcutt, who at that time was on the staff of the AAJC.

I took my finalized proposal to the AAJC's Student Personnel Commission in March. I still had only begun to feel the problem. I thought that if all the

rhetoric on "stay in the system," "no violence," "due process" had a grain of sincerity in it, my proposal to develop sophisticated student governments at two-year schools would be readily received and embraced. All the "professionals" in the room knew what their student governments were all about. In these three days, I was encouraged by the off-hand remarks about "student games" in that I felt that these individuals might, in the wake of the student revolt (however distant it seemed from central Kansas) see a route for constructively and meaningfully involving their students.

The proposal wasn't complicated. (A copy is attached.) It was based on this notion: Insufficient information existed as to the real needs and concerns of the two-year student as defined and identified by the students themselves. Toward this end, I proposed that NSA and the AAJC jointly plan and host four exploratory meetings, of 20-25 students each with 6 consultants, in May. They were to be intensive, in depth, unstructured conversations among sympathetic "professionals" and student leaders.

I had no idea where they would lead. I had no specific "product" in mind. I made a presentation. Then the Commission reacted. First it was good--"we need to know more," "anything we can do to improve the educational climate," "good to see NSA has begun to realize the unique needs of the two-year student," and so on. And then: "too many national organizations," "communications are bad enough on the local levels," "nothing will come out of it," "the solution is at home, not at a national conference," and so forth. The Commission adjourned for lunch with a couple of pending motions, one of which was a wholehearted endorsement. Something happened during lunch, and a new motion was introduced. It reaffirmed their interests in students, and said the AAJC should work through "any appropriate national agency or organization" in assisting students. My mind reeled back to my student government experiences. I had seen this type of

resolution before. It was a not too subtle side-step of the whole question. Everyone saw it, and some afterwards indicated to me that it tore at them. It passed with a single dissent.

I was a little shaken. I had become involved in the maze really for two reasons. First, I actually believed that I needed their "expertise." Second, I needed their support for funding.

Several good things did result from my stay in Atlanta. Dr. Edmund Gleazer, Executive Director of the AAJC, indicated that we should get together when we got back to Washington. Dr. Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Chairman of the Student Personnel Commission and President of the Northampton County Area Community College, reaffirmed his interest and promised to help me out in setting up the meetings. Dr. Jane Matson, presently at Cal State-L.A., also encouraged me to continue.

What followed the meeting in Atlanta became weeks (and then months) of phone calls, conversations, and letters over the proposed exploratory meetings. As tedious as it sometimes was, I was beginning to get a grasp for the problems of the student at the junior college. However, by April a couple of things became clear to me:

> One, there was a compelling need to bring these students together to talk among themselves.
>
> Two, no money was available from the AAJC or anyone else for the meetings.
>
> Three, there were about 7 weeks remaining before finals, and if they were to be held, NSA would have to do the planning and financing with the assistance of a group of junior college professionals whom I had grown to trust and respect.

I felt the press of time, and after securing two sites for the meetings (through the help of Dr. Richardson and Dr. Matson), I did it. Despite the fact that NSA had little to spare for anything, I felt that unless the move was made, the opportunity would be lost indefinitely. The budget of the two meetings was

slightly under $800.00, and I authorized the money from internal (and sparse) funds.

I should note that I cite this set of experiences neither to satisfy my ego nor to lay out an all too familiar pattern of bureaucratic hassling. I give this as an introduction to illustrate how I moved to where I am today on junior college students.

While this was unraveling, our office was rocking each day with the events on the campus. As building after building fell, as the community response grew angrier, as the number of clubbed heads multiplied--the cry from Nixon, from Hesburgh, from Abrams, from Mitchell, Pusey, and all the rest was a urgent plea for "due process," "joint reasoning," "calm logic" to solve what everyone recognized as problems which needed attention. In one sense the pleas fell without effect, because the time for talk was so limited on so many campuses and the frustration level too high, and the anger too deep.

The meetings were scheduled, one at Glendale College (outside Los Angeles) and one at Triton College (outside Chicago). Before traveling to L.A., I stopped off in Peoria as an invited speaker at the Student Division meeting of the Illinois Association of Junior and Community Colleges. I spent about a day there. I got into several interesting conversations with students on racism, black identity, and educational reform which lasted quite late. For the most part, however, the students, as their "adult" counterparts, were involved in acting out the "traditional conference." With a smattering of student panels admist a tightly structured meeting, it seemed as though the major goal of the conference circled around the continuance of the Association. Many of the student leaders were seriously into the mixture of politics, booze, and sex which typifies conferences. Occasionally they talked about the "incredible student apathy" on their campuses, then back to their electioneering. I saw bright, competent student

leaders satisfying themselves on the meager diet of who would be the next officers. I didn't hear any basic questions being asked. One student I talked to described the meeting as "pooled ignorance in an incestuous setting." Through all of it, many went unsatisfied. I began to get a grasp of what the two-year student government was working with.

Within this prospectus, I will repeatedly use information and perceptions gleaned from the two meetings that followed. Here it is appropriate that I lay out certain general facts about the meetings.

The initial letter announcing the meetings went to selected junior college deans of students who were asked to recommend one "articulate student leader, not necessarily restricted to student government." This route was chosen for two reasons: first, there was little time and I felt this would be more productive than a letter to the student government president. Second, and more important, I wanted to see what kind of student would come from this type of selection:... the "Dean's man," "the dissenter," "the titled representative." Almost without exception, all of the students at both meetings were in some way affiliated with student government, although only a handful were the student government presidents themselves.

Each participant was sent a mailing which included four "reaction papers." These were: "Student Protest in the Junior College" by Dr. Milton O. Jones; "The Junior College Student: A Research Description" by K. Patricia Cross; "Student As Nigger" by Gerald Farber; and "Student Activities in the Junior College" by Dr. Marie Prahl. These were intended to stimulate thinking before the meetings.

The participants were not "representative" (but did have representative qualities) of junior college students as a whole. They were representatives of an elite by virtue of their titles, their interest and the fact that they classified themselves (without exception) as "transfer students" bound for four-year colleges. They were not involved in any technical or trade skills. They

were in university-bound disciplines. There were no radicals. All, at best, were reformers who were willing to utilize existing channels for change. They were bright, responsive, and eager.

Generally I found two striking perceptions about the people who came.

First, a deep feeling of powerlessness to reform what was admitted to be an inadequate atmosphere. "Only two years, so many apathetic students, unsympathetic or superficial administrators, stultifying bureaucratic mazes." I could feel that many of those present had experienced defeat more than once. They had tried and they had lost in solitary ventures, without significant backing or interest. Their titles had not, in the end, meant very much to themselves or to others.

Second, a deep craving for something material; a product to come from the meeting itself. One participant said he would have a hard time justifying the expense for a "weekend of talking." A need for the "packaged program" for campus reform hung over a meeting that had been carefully described as an "identifying conversation" on problems and needs. At the end of each meeting, some began to realize that the "product" was intangible but real--that the product had to be a sensitivity to who they were, what their institutions were all about, and how they related.

What I gained from the meetings follows, but it can be stated generally. What began in December as a casual interest became a serious commitment to needs that I can now feel and identify with. I now see that organizing the now unorganized may carry positive ramifications for the betterment of the individual experience at the junior college. I see that change must come from the students themselves. The people who feel the problems are now the experts...they must have as much (if not more) a role in the solutions as the professional.

The Problem: Who is the Junior College Student?

As the community college is the most accessible form of higher education in the United States, it is by no means surprising that the college serves nearly every type of high school graduate, as well as other segments of the neighboring community. This diverse student body, with sharply differing needs and backgrounds, presents an awesome challenge to faculty and administration. One of the lessons of the two-year institution is that it can be rightfully said that there are unique and significant differences between the student at the junior and "senior" institution.

The available research on the junior college student, in the light of this difference, is very new and hardly extensive. Like the institutions themselves, the student at the two-year school is a relatively recent phenomenon.

Charles C. Collins has suggested that the "junior college student is almost as varied as humanity itself."[1] He indicates that there are at least 13 "types" of students at the two-year school. A synthesis of his classifications shows that, as far as academic and intellectual characteristics are concerned, the student varies from the highly motivated and able to the low achievers, the immature, and the uninterested. In addition to this wide range of high school graduates, the community college also attracts the student who was unsuccessful at the four-year school, as well as a whole group of individuals who, after an educational pause, are returning or beginning college. This latter group will include the housewife, the veteran, the businessman, and the high school dropout.

More interesting than the general "types" are the motivations that Collins suggests. Only 5 of the 13 classifications have a definite and primary career orienta-

---

[1]Collins, "Junior College Personnel Programs: What Are They and What Should They Be?" AAJC, 1967, p. 12. (Hereafter cited as "Collins.")

tion or goal, either vocationally or educationally. For the remainder, the motivations seem to be primarily psychological or emotional. In those latter categories we find the junior college student who is: unable to attend any other college; motivated as a result of social or family pressures to "go to college"; seeking intellectual stimulation or motivation; lacking in intellectual disposition or maturity; convinced of the significance of 'The Degree,' but whose perceptions of success are "murky"; or interested in extending his high school social life.[2] The psychological ramifications of these motivations upon achievement and identity are awesome.

At the exploratory meetings, the motivations for attending the two-year school were about as varied. Four examples should suffice:

> Karen was an eighteen year old high school graduate who had been accepted to a state university, but she felt "unsure of herself", wanted to live at home, and attend a "small college". Her parents had the money to send her away to school, and she felt they were "upset" over her decision.
>
> Jack was a twenty-eight year old high school graduate who had involuntarily withdrawn from a state university, and enlisted in the Marines where he spent 6 years. Upon discharge, he worked and built his own business. Now he is attending the two-year college because he wants to re-establish himself academically and get a degree from a university.
>
> Frank was a nineteen year old high school graduate who said he wasn't sure why he attended the nearby community college, except that he did not want to be drafted, and he could find no job which satisfied him.
>
> Mary was a twenty-one year old high school graduate who first enrolled in a program for dental secretaries and, after an experience in student government, switched into a university-bound program. When she entered the college neither her grades nor her financial resources permitted her to go elsewhere.

These examples, of course, reveal only the surface, and the real question of how their experiences forged their identities and concepts of the institution and them-

---

[2] Ibid.

selves remains to be answered.

K. Patricia Cross has recently completed a servey of the self-concepts of the two-year student which reveals a good deal more, although even she admits that there is "almost a complete lack of any systematic investigation of (the two-year students') reactions to their college experience."[3] The Cross study repeatedly indicated, in areas of academics, environment, goals, and personality characteristics, that there were sharp and significant distinctions separating the two and four-year student.

From her study we know that the two-year student is more likely to come from a home which is not "college-oriented." We know that cost is a large factor in the choice of the junior college. We know that the community college has a more practical and less intellectual orientation that the university student. Her research also reveals that junior college students "are not sufficiently sure of themselves to venture into new and untried fields, and they appear to seek more certain pathways to success and financial security."[4] She also suggests that, except in non-academic abilities, the two-year student does not feel as well-prepared, and consequently, or as confident as the four year student.

From this study (and other studies that are included in the Cross survey), it is clear that the student at the two-year institution has a different motivation, ability, and background than the student at the university. The Cross study does not however examine the ramifications of these differences on the educational experience. The crux of this proposal rests on the notion that significant differences suggest unique and significant needs. Cross indicates in her conclusion that much remains to be researched about students at the two-year institution. What are the

---

[3]Cross, The Junior College Student--A Research Description," Educational Testing Service, 1968, pp. 36-37.

[4]Ibid., p. 51.

effects of the home environment? What is the psychological impact of the cost factor? What are the ramifications of conditioned, "unrealistic aspirations"? What are the self-perceptions of the community college student? What are the special abilities of the student who is attracted to the two-year institution?

Utilizing this and other scientific research as a basis, we grouped together junior college students to discover their reactions to related questions. Probably the most significant result of the exploratory meetings was the phrasing of some new questions which need further exploration, and they can be grouped as follows:

1. <u>What are your perceptions of the community and the college</u>?

The Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., has described the relationship of the community and the college in this statement:

> "A good community college will be honestly, gladly, and clearly a community institution. It is in and of the community. The community is used as an extension of classroom and laboratory. Drawing upon its history, traditions, personnel, problems, assets, and liabilities, it declares its role and finds this accepted and understood by faculty, administration, students, and the citizenry....The community college is 'democracy's college' of this century and will respond to its potential as it is defined in terms of its own purposes and evaluated in the light of its own goals."

Embodied in this notion is the idea that the junior college become a "community project," with the promise of frequent and close interaction between academic and non-academic segments of the total community. There is the further promise that the college will be a popularizer of education not only to those immediately involved but also those who are not directly associated with the institution.

As so many of the disruptions this year at universities have centered on "outside community influences"--ROTC, Dow, military recruiters, National Guardsmen, and police--it is important to consider the perceptions of students at colleges which are "in and of the community," and are almost completely supported by the nearby neighbor-

hoods. Whatever the extent of community influence or control, it is clear that, in this instance, the "community" is no distant commodity. Many students work and live in the district that supports the school. For many students, their initial employment may be found a few blocks from the institution itself. The trustees are not "absentee landlords"; they can be readily reached by phone or personal visit.

From the start two things were clear about the students' perceptions. First, most of them were considering the role of the community for the first time. Second, they did not, for the most part, indicate any profound distrust or dislike of "community interests." Some students did indicate that "community control" meant repression of academic freedom of inquiry. After some discussion, it became apparent that nearly everyone agreed that there were differing political, social, and moral values associated with the college as opposed to that of the community. Examples of open conflict between these differing values were found in attempted or successful suppression of certain articles in the school newspaper, or in the prohibition of a certain controversial speaker. One student suggested that the junior college was a "conscious agent of the status quo" in faithfully serving local business interests. Another individual retorted (with notable sarcasm) that "intellectual freedom wasn't necessary to the tradesmen," and therefore the community could have as much control as it desired. A conversation then began on what "types" of "control" existed. It was suggested (by a resource person present) that the average community influence could all be categorized as "negative control" in that, if the community was dissatisfied, it would defeat bond issues, elect "conservative" trustees, petition for the removal of a dean or president and so forth. Furthermore, the most important form of control was exercised "positively" by the "elite" within the community, in that business interests have formed advisory committees on curricu-

lum, that influential members or representatives of the "elite" are, in many instances, the trustees, and through financing the special and regular programs of the college. The group seemed to accept these notions, but without any noticeable emotion.

As the conversation continued, it became clear that the community college was, beyond simply educating the students, serving occasional functions for the non-student members of the community, such as plays, lectures, tutoring, charity drives, seminars, special evening courses, and so on. Some suggested that, outside of these examples and instances where the community reacted to a controversial program on campus, the community tended to identify with the college when there was a prominent or successful athletic activity.

It is interesting that in a recent survey of two-year institutions in the North Central Accrediting Region, only 58.2% of the colleges polled provided as orientation on college philosophy to student government leaders.[5] Only 52.4% of the students surveyed thought there should be such a program while 91.8% of the administrators were in favor of more orientation.[6] In an institution that has such unique motivation for existence, it is surprising that so little is apparently being done to transmit and explain its mission. This inadequacy was very apparent at the two exploratory meetings--students were not, by and large, aware of the dynamic of their own institution or the junior college phenomenon.

At both meetings, students felt that rather than ignoring or appeasing community influence on a period of conflict, there should be educational programs with the community explaining and defending the concepts of academic freedom.

Perhaps some indication of community sentiment can be culled from the results

---

[5]McAninch, "Can Student and Administrators Communicate?" Junior College Journal, March 1969, p. 111.

[6]Ibid., p. 114.

of a recent survey on the trustees at the two-year insitiution conducted by Mr. Rodney T. Harnett of the Educational Testing Service.[7] Mr. Harnett suggested that "trustees of public junior colleges are the 'least freedom-oriented'... (stemming from) a tendency of publicly-elected trustees to see themselves as protectors of the public interest." A "public interest," in the instance of the community college.[8] While on certain questions the junior college trustees responses represented a more popularized and available form of education, 45% felt that the administration should control the contents of the school newspaper, 76% favored a screening process for speakers, 86% favored suspension or dismissal for student disrupters, 64% believed that a loyalty oath for a professor was "reasonable," and 57% felt that "running a college is basically like running a business." In each of these questions, the public junior college trustee response was higher than any of the other trustee categories. It is reasonable to assume that the philosophy that these responses represent have had some impact on the educational experience.

What that impact is, from the viewpoint of the student, remains largely unknown.

2. How does the home and employment environment affect your college experience?

Nearly all students at the community college are commuters, and most of these are freshmen who are recent high school graduates and live with their parents. "All recent studies" indicate that 50% of the students hold part-time jobs, and 30% work twenty or more hours a week.[9]

---

[7]See Chronicle of Higher Education, January 13, 1969.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Collins, supra, p. 11.

Patricia Cross stated that the junior college student is "more likely to be cautious and controlled, less likely to be venturesome and flexible in (his) thinking."[10] It is unfortunate that she did not relate this conclusion to her research on environmental factors for it is apparent that, because of daily influence, the two-year student living at home is likely to remain satisfied with the familiar.

One conclusion to be drawn from the meeting with junior college students is that there is very little change in the transition from the high school to the junior college. Secondly, his friendships are only expanded; the high school group remains at the core. His behavior, beyond slight relaxation of his hours at night and his acquisition of an automobile, remains about the same. His experiences and his exposure are not greatly increased in the same way as a student who goes away to school, and it would naturally follow in at least some cases that the constant reinforcement of familiar behavior would not lend itself positively to confidence in new experiences.

Where an identifiable physical structure exists known as "the College," the change no doubt is greater. But what about the newly created institution which has only temporary facilities on loan from the high school?

Another conclusion that resulted was the realization that the "home" may represent the most effective means of community control. Research is needed to discover what the extent is of transferred "acceptable behavior" in the home into educational experience. How does this affect the goals of the student reformer? What impact does it have on student activism at the community college? A recent pamphlet on two year students, produced by the YMCA, states that while the student is "carving out" increasing independence, "he still wishes to or finds it necessary to remain a child in his family."[11] Can one be a "child" in one situation, and an "adult" in another?

---

[10]Cross, supra, p. 51.

[11]"Who Goes to the Community/Junior College?" YMCA, New York.

What are the conflicts involved in this?

It would appear that an established life style, for many junior college students, accepts the addition of the college experience which may not materially alter what he did before entering the college. How this affects his identity will be discussed later.

3. Is there an inferiority complex felt by junior college students, and what if any are its ramifications?

While there are several studies available on student self-confidence, there appears to be very little research that deals directly with this question.

At least two surveys suggest that there may be a large degree of "unrealistic aspirations" involved in entering junior college freshmen. According to a 1965 California study, of "lower ability students," 53% enrolled in transfer programs, while only 24% began in vocational programs.[12] A Florida study indicated that 80% of entering freshmen felt that they would finish four years of higher education. A follow-up study showed that 21% had transferred upon graduation, and 9% had transferred before graduation.[13] What happened to the other 50%? We can infer from both these studies that there is a degree of prestige in declaring oneself a transfer student, and intimating that the stay at the junior college is only a stage in further educational development. Collins concludes that "the occupational choices of junior college students reflect a strong desire to entrench their rather shaky position in the middle class."[14]

This problem apparently has been felt in the occupational programs of the two-year

---

[12]Collins, supra, p. 11.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Ibid.

institution, which are so important to the "comprehensive college" philosophy. Dr. Gleazer has indicated that the "problem begins with an enthusiasm in our society for the 'upper' (white collar) occupations, emphasizing the professional and managerial categories, and consequently giving lower status to other occupational categories."[15] He continues, "there is no question that a major problem confronting occupational education is its comparative lack of prestige."[16]

In a broader sense, it could be said that a major problem confronting the junior college is its comparative lack of prestige. Without the established traditions, history, and academic reputation that are possessed by many four-year schools (and therefore transferred to all "senior" institutions), the community college remains somewhat "junior." Of course, this notion is rapidly changing as more and more two-year institutions become established, institutionally and academically. But such perceptual changes are admittedly slow.

At the exploratory meetings, once the question of inferiority was presented, the reactions indicated that, in some sense, this problem was felt by the participants. One student, in a private conversation afterward, said he felt the problem acutely. He had graduated from a suburban high school where many of his friends had continued on to institutions which had rejected him. After two years at the community college, he was now able to attend a "senior" institution. How was he affected by the weekend visits of those students who were away at school, or his weekend visits to those schools for the "big game" or the fraternity party? Apparently those experiences had their impact on him, and on the identity he felt for his community college.

---

[15] Gleazer, This is the Community College, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968, p.71.

[16] Ibid, p.72.

From one of the meetings, it was suggested that this feeling of inferiority could be roughly classified into two categories.

First, his perceptions of himself as identified as a student at the junior college. Was he somehow "junior" because of that identification? This seemed to be particularly felt by the student who did not have a "material" reason for attending the two-year institution--such as the lack of money or employment.

Second, there seemed to be some question involved in the impact of administrators and faculty members at the junior college. It must be admitted that, despite the growth of specialized educational programs for junior college instructors and administrators, these programs have not been fully felt, and the "professional" may be as uncertain of his own prestige as the student. (On a personal side, I had an experience at the AAJC Convention which really pressed this home. By coincidence, I happened to meet a former teacher of mine who was not a dean at a large community college. After introducing him to a friend, I was asked, in his presence, how we happened to know one another. I hesitated. The dean had taught social studies when I was in junior high school. I identified him as a "former teacher" fearful that he might be sensitive about his background. Perhaps the sensitivity was entirely mine? In any event, the "prestige" problem was present.)

When we know that 40% of junior college students would have preferred to enter another "type of college" if finances and education had permitted,[17] when we know that as the four-year institution grows more selective, the reason for attending the two-year school will increasingly be the "negative one of exclusion from colleges with higher status"[18]--there may exist a very serious conflict of status and self-

---

[17] Collins, supra, p.11.

[18] Ibid., p.10.

perception felt by the student himself with its effect upon his education and the institution. More information is needed on the ramifications of that feeling.

4. What are the feelings of identity the junior college student feels for his college?

A discussion of this question would be incomplete without first noting what the identify is of the junior college itself. It would appear that the junior college movement, with all its strength, is having a hard time forging a unique classification for what is in fact a unique institution. Even the present struggle with its name--"junior" or "community"--can indicate the identity pains of this new educational movement, so often evaluated under criteria that are not applicable to its needs and abilitites.

As Dr. Gleazer has put it,

> "What criteria for excellence would be developed for an institution whose student body was composed of a cross section of the population of the community rather than a slice of the top? High tuition charges, high selectivity, residential programs, liberal arts emphasis--all of the factors commonly associated with the prestige of educational institutions--were on one side of the coin, and publicly-supported, open-door, low-cost, commuting student body community college was on the other. On what basis does this kind of institution win its place?"[19]

There can be little doubt that the identity struggle of the institution and its professionals is shared by the junior college student. Continuing on the assumption that positive feelings of identity with the college positively affect the individual's approach to his studies and encourage his concern for the

---

[19] Gleazer, supra, p.13.

betterment of the college, then we must conclude that the junior college, unlike the residential "senior" institution, needs special emphasis to overcome peculiar barriers to achieving that identity.

When a student's hours on campus are largely confined to lectures, labs, and study periods between classes due to the fact that he commutes or is employed, special programs are needed to bring the student into greater involvement with the college, and to permit him to enjoy a more flexible and informal educational experience than that which is usually found in the lecture. Otherwise, his education is indeed narrowed to basic course work, tests, and grades. The goal of any education should be broader than this.

Competing in addition to school identity and involvement is the home, and perhaps a circle of friends and activities formed before the college experience. There may also be an additional consideration for the purely goal oriented student who sees the two-year institution as a necessary step, takes what he needs, and then leaves.

While any program must operate within the parameters of employment and academics, there seems to be a great deal in the four-year commuter college experience which has not been adapted to the two-year. With many differences, these two types of institutions share common problems: the commuter, the home, the job. Good freshman orientation programs, experimental colleges, legal aid programs--all student motivated and operated--can be the beginning of better involvement, and the realization that college can be the source of valuable skills which may or may not be counted into a degree requirement. It is in the stimulation of the individual to gain a better awareness of himself and of others while developing individual communication and learning styles that could constructively supplement any formal course of instruction.

The fact that only two years are available for this type of development should be viewed not as a brake, but as a reason for acceleration of the humanizing processes.

The need for this is clear. "Strains are potentially more acute in the community college for several reasons: the heterogeneity of students and faculty; explosive growth and proliferation of new institutions--colleges without traditions and established leadership structures; and the evolution of role definitions for faculty, students, and administration in an institution still determining its logical forms for organization...But this is more than a matter of organization. It is also a problem of leadership. Without doubt, among many issues and concerns, one of the most serious is the need for an alert and highly competent leadership throughout the institution so that a productive equilibrium can be maintained."[20]

In the quest for that equilibrium, the community college has all too often neglected the development of student leaders so they could become a viable part of the needed solutions.

5. The Student Government and Junior College Activism

In concluding on the effectiveness of junior college student personnel programs, Dr. T.R. McConnell stated bluntly that they are "woefully inadequate."[21] While almost no available research on community college student governments exists, there would probably be little disagreement with the conclusion that their programs are traditional and nonsensical and that, for the most part, they are playing little or no meaningful role in finding solutions to the needs of the institutions.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 134 (emphasis added).

[21] Collins, supra, p. iii.

Therefore, being no part of the solution, they amount to another facet of the problem.

At each of the exploratory meetings, a hard question was asked of the student leaders present: If your student government, without publicity, closed its doors tomorrow, how long would it take for anyone to notice? Everyone agreed that it would be some time indeed for anyone--short of the Director of Student Activities--to realize that the student association no longer was functioning. This gives some insight into the type of program involvement of the community college student government.

At another time, perhaps this situation could continue without any serious consequence. University administrators and faculties were quite content in the period preceding the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley to allow student associations to piddle along, spending their allocations and passing resolutions. Superficially, they were neither helping nor hurting anyone. When ad hoc activist groups began to form and clamor for reform, the student government was completely incapable of having any role. Discarded and disregarded by the students, and only formally accepted by the administration, the student government on many campuses became the first identifiable anachronism.

Today, the student government at the four-year institution is well on its way to realizing its potential and gaining the type of meaningful role that is essential to the "equilibrium of the institution." Amidst the clamor of the militant left, there has been a quieter but no less significant series of changes in the university student government. Few student associations still expand hours of energy on the dances, floats, and charitable activities of the pre-Berkeley student council. Instead, increasingly their resources are being expanded on course and teacher evaluation, drug education programs, speakers series, student legal aid,

freshman orientation program reforms, and community involvement. Increasingly, their interest has turned to academic reform, participation in university government, and development of more meaningful educational programs. These moves toward constructive and meaningful change through regular channels have, no doubt, avoided countless campus disruptions, because the student government has begun to realize and service the needs of its constituents.

At the junior college level, the student government remains little more than a continuation of its counterpart in high school.

A recent study on junior college activism at 68 institutions in 30 states revealed that while demonstrations have not reached a serious level, there is an increasing indication of serious student unrest.[22] There were three different categories of protest. Level One included resolutions, petitions, editorials; Level Two were "legitimate physical protest" such as tolerated or approved picketing of a non-disruptive nature; Level Three was the "defiant protest" including disruption, sit-ins, and "clashing with authority." There were 201 reported instances of "level one" protest, which is remarkable in the fact that there were so few. More interesting are 24 protests in "level two," and 13 in "level three." The survey does not indicate if there were any institutions that experienced no protest of any sort, or those that had multiple protests. The author postulated that the organized protest was largely limited to the Midwest and the Southwest. In each of the 14 "issue categories," a large number (ranging from as few as 39 to as many as 65) indicated that there was no protest whatsoever on that particular issue. The most frequent protest seemed to center on food service, dress codes, student

---

[22]"Student Protest in the Junior College," by Dr. Milton O. Jones, Dean of Students, St. Petersburg Junior College, Clearwater, Florida.

publications and student representation in governance.

This part of the study is of significance because of the fact that there was so little "protest" at two year institutions. In essence, "level one" (editorials, petitions, and resolutions) is not a classification of "protest" but instead is an indication of concern, interest, and awareness. In that sense, the totals are appalling in a category that is the most acceptable and legitimate form of dissent. Assuming that the campus atmosphere is not so perfect that no one has a grievance, the explanation must be found elsewhere.

The deans of students were then asked what, in their opinion, was the reason for the relative lack of protest. The four most important institutional characteristics in this regard, were the non-residential nature of the college, faculty accessibility, counseling, and student activities. The four most important student characteristics were practical orientation, home and community influence, employment, and part-time jobs.

It is interesting to note that the major problems of the institution, as far as building a sense of identity with the institution, became assets in that they were important factors in discouraging protests. Again, if "protest" (particularly on levels one and two) is really but a sign of interest, then it is fair to conclude from this survey that either there is a serious lack of concern, or that concern has not surfaced in an organized and recognizable manner, either through an editorial in the school newspaper or a peaceful demonstration.

Finally, the study demonstrated that while most of the colleges had adopted, on some bureaucratic level, a policy of protest, 55% had not sought legal opinion on the institutional response to protest, and about 45% of the boards of trustees had taken no action to prepare for protest activities. This seems to indicate that they see no imminent problems. There really is very little question that the ingredients for conflict are present. The real question facing junior college admin-

istrators is whether or not, in the future, protest can be channeled in a rational and peaceful way.

At the present, the student government structure is the only avenue for expressing student grievances and proposals to the administration and faculty.[23] A recent study by Mr. Harold McAninch[24] on community colleges reaffirms the concept of the student government as a relatively powerless and traditional institution. The study, which is no doubt one of the very few on the junior college student government, was motivated because of administration concern over activism and its possible relationship with an active and meaningful student association. Unfortunately, the survey does not reveal any of the programmatic aspects of the student government. The problem can be initially seen by the fact that a number of student governments serve only on a semester basis, nearly a third do not send representatives to a state meeting, over a third do not meet weekly, and 65% of the colleges polled have an administrative veto over all actions of the student association. In addition, in an area that connotes relevancy and respect, 25% of the student governments have no control <u>whatsoever</u> in determining how the student activity fee is allocated. It is interesting to note that only 24% of the students favored sole responsibility for activity fee expenditures. Mr. McAninch concludes by saying that the "role of the student government organizations, on most campuses, appears to need better definition if potential problems are to be avoided."[25]

However, much more is needed than "better definitions." We need to find ways in which the student government becomes more stabilized, organizationally and more

---

[23](The Activism Study by Dr. Jones uncovered only four SDS chapters out of 68 colleges.)

[24]McAninch, "Can Students and Administrations Communicate?" <u>Junior College Journal</u>, March 1969, p. 110.

[25]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 116.

meaningful, programmatically.

At the present time, there are no doubt less than a dozen junior college student governments which are sponsoring educational seminars, planning freshman orientations, operating experimental colleges, or offering a student legal rights program. Part of the reason that this is not occurring is that they do not have access to the experience of others so that they could then have the necessary models to work from. A good example of this is The Joint Statement on Academic Rights and Freedoms, which was formulated in 1968 by the National Student Association, in conjunction with the American Association of University Professors, The Association of American Colleges, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and has been used by a number of universities in establishing their own policy. How many community college student body presidents have even seen it? The dearth of information on the two-year student government is, in part, indicated by the fact that there is no available list on the number of existing junior college student state associations, much less any information on what they are doing.

Unlike the four-year student association which has two national organizations and a number of city and regional confederations, the student government at the two-year school, while facing unique and difficult problems, has no organization which is developing programs to meet its special needs.

In part, national associations for student governments were formed to satisfy a compelling need for student association stability. Too often, the change in student administrations meant a complete loss of whatever had been accomplished the year before. Plagued with haphazard filing and poorly kept records, the need for a national library of information was recognized some years ago hy the USNSA. The two-year college student government, due to a greater changeover, has even a more compelling need for national coordination and effort. As Dr. Max R. Raines, has

said:

> An engineers' club may spend its time planning a dance to raise money for a bigger dance,and seldom or never concern itself with examining the many facets of a career in engineering. A dedicated staff of students may work hard putting out a yearbook for fellow students, half of whom have with drawn from college by delivery date. In short, the participation functions must be continually evaluated in terms of the students they serve and the climate in which they operate." (Emphasis added.)[26]

Keeping in mind the limited exposure and experience of the average leader at junior colleges, the question must be asked: Upon what standard and against what criteria is this evaluation to take place?

The major problem presently facing community college student governments can be stated quite simply. While many student leaders have the initiative, the capability and the resources - they don't know what to do. Their experiences are limited to conferences with other schools who are equally uncertain and uninformed. They have no models or no research library on projects they could consider. These are not the apathetic or satisfied students. These are individuals who, while acutely feeling certain needs and problems, are eager for assistance. No doubt some left these two meetings disappointed that a "packaged program" was not handed to them.

If one thing has become clear within the student community in the last three or four years, it is simply that in most institutions the day of administrative paternalism is over. The case is presently one for increased independence from the university administration. There is really very little intellectual reception left for the notion that the activities of the student government should be a "structured laboratory" which is "well designed" by the school's personnel administrators.

---

[26] Report of the Student Personnel Workshop--Harper College, AAJC, 1968, p. 41.

We can only consider it to be a matter of time when the ploy of meaningless school booster projects and mixers will be abandoned in favor of more academically justifiable projects and concerns. The two-year college student council needs desperately to begin to consider how it will meet this challenge. We know that SDS has announced that one of its goals for the academic year 1968-69 is to build organizations at the junior college. This should be taken as a harbinger of what can be expected to occur in student sophistication at that level.

The need for inter-communication between student associations at two-year colleges is quite clear and compelling, for the sake of dissemination and compilation of information to meet unique and significant needs. To effectuate the student government would be to build a viable channel of communication between the student and the professional, and go a long way in making that student association a respected force for constructive reform with in the college community.[27]

---

27. It should be noted that as this prospectus was in its final stage a new survey on activism was brought to the author's attention, "Student Activism in Junior Colleges" by Dr. John Lombardi, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1969. This study, in large part, affirms the conclusions set forth in this section. However, in any further discussion of the topic this new work will have to be included. In one sense, the very fact of its publication indicates the increasing concern over this problem.

The Program

The National Student Association, the oldest and largest confederation of student governments in the nation today, is uniquely fitted to respond to the needs of the community college student. N.S.A. services the increasing constituent demand for up to date and competent programs in areas that centrally affect one's education - student drug usage, draft conseling, curricular reform, student legal rights and course and teacher evaluation. NSA membership has spiraled in the past 2 years from 271 to nearly 400 member student governments. The financial resources of the Association come from one of three primary sources (dues comprise less than 5% of our total budget): private foundations such as Ford, Stern and Field; federal agencies such as the Office of Economic Opportunity, National Institute of Mental Health, and the Office of Education; and through NSA's own Student Services Division which offers low-cost educational travel, the NSA Record Club, computerized job-finding, and entertainment booking, to name but a few.

In our 22 year history, the Association has developed the largest national library of information on student associations and their problems, as well as the formulation of over 60 available publications on various matters of student concern.

Let me be more specific about the programs and services of NSA which would be adaptable to existing resources for the community college student government.

The Center for Educational Reform, financed by the Ford Foundation, is an attempt to serve students interested in experimental projects, changes incurriculum and structure, a more relevant educational experience. The Center provides literature, consultations, and training conferences, and plans a number of in-depth summer training programs for students interested in working next year

for educational reform.

The Student Legal Rights program publishes a College Law Bulletin providing information on key cases involving student rights. It provides relevant papers written by lawyers and law school faculty; ran the First National Conference on the Legal Rights and Problems of Students with more than a dozen attorneys as resource persoonnel; and has planned several regional conferences. This program aids student governments and individual students in finding legal assistance, and is involved in Federal litigation on precedent-setting cases in student rights and freedoms. In a time of confusion and frustrations, it is an attempt to use the law to effect change and protect citizens. Not revolutionary, simply straightforward and necessary.

The NSA Drug Studies program has, over the past three years run three national and numerous regional conferences on student drug involvement, provided consultations, published background papers and distributed relevant literature, and will soon begin publication of a bulletin on significant courtroom cases and medical findings involving drug use. It seeks to educate and inform, and does not encourage drug use; it does its best to deal with a pressing campus issue which is also a national problem of enormous proportions, as demonstrated by the more than 100,000 arrests for drug violations in the state of California during 1968.

The Vietnam draft desk has provided information on draft regulations and the alternatives under the law available to students. This program has run regional conferences to train draft conselors using lawyers and those familiar with the law as resourse personnel. Its task is to provide information needed by young men faced with the draft.

The Black Commission of NSA is currently developing programs of particular interest and benefit to black students, including the First National Black Student Film Festival, summer travel opportunities for black students in Africa and

Latin America, a black speakers bureau, the development of a black student newspaper with national distribution, and, most importantly, the support for three black organizers who provide training and assistance for BSU's and student groups on black campuses.

The NSA Training Institute has run sessions for interested student governments and campus groups on problems of freshman orientation and development of effective studentleadership within student governments.

The National Student Travel Association (NSTA), NSA's travel affiliate, continues to serve 250,000 students yearly on a nonprofit basis (70 Fifth Avenue, New York City), providing low-cost educational travel opportunities. The Association continues to provide low-cost life insurance, distribute student films, provide cost-free job-finding service for graduating seniors, assist in booking talent for campuses, and in general to seek new opportunities to provide services to students at minimum cost.

While these programs and services, coupled with NSA's staff of 50 full time college aged employees, can act as an excellent resource base for the community college, investigations in the past few months have clearly shown that there is more needed. A special staff who would adapt and transfer present programming, while formulating new services designed for specific and immediate problems at the two year institutions, is necessary.

Recognizing the fact that problems do exist, why is it necessary to reinforce the student government at the junior college? There are several reasons why this avenue is best.

First, however, unorganized and ineffective intercommunication may be at present, the student government is the sole available student network into all junior colleges.

Second, the resources of the student associations, both financially and

in attracting available student leadership, means that there is an existing structure in which real work can begin.

Third, student governments traditionally and formally enjoy a friendly relationship with faculty and administration. On most campuses, the student association is officially regarded as the representative of the student community.

Finally, it is important to realize that the student government structure can be a vehicle for truly significant and constructive participation within the community college. NSA would not be as interested if it were merely a question of fortifying structures. NSA's interest lies in the fact that the resulting programs and services emanating from that structure will be beneficial to the entire college community. The student association is an available, established channel to initiate meaningful student projects.

Therefore, we propose that there be created within the structure of the National Student Association, an Assistance Center for Community and Junior College Students with the following objectives:

1. To become a center for information and material on the community college student associations.
2. To involve community college student leaders in the formulation of services and programs directed to their needs and concerns.
3. To afford community college student governments a national focus for communication and exchange of ideas and information.

The program, in specific, can be divided into two concurrent and overlapping thrusts: Information, Research and Program Development; and Information and Program Exchange.

I. Information, Research and Program Development

The first task of the new center will be, of course, to alert community colleges to its existence. There are several avenues through which this can be, at least partially, accomplished. After information is formulated on the goals

and projects, existing community college-related organizations could be utilized to publicize the Center. The American Association of Junior Colleges, which has been very cooperative since the beginning of this work, could be expected to print articles, within its newsletter and magazine on the establishment of the Center.

Other professional educational associations, with junior college divisions or interests, could also help in this publicity. There are to my knowledge no less than five existing and functioning state associations of junior college students. Good contacts already exist with the associations in Michigan, California, and Illinois. These would be valuable resources in the initial and continuing effort of the Center. One bulk mailing would have to be sent to student body presidents at every junior college in the nation inviting them to affiliate with NSA and the Center. Dues for the first year will be $5.00 per student government.

The program itself however will hopefully be announced and discussed in August, when NSA is hosting the first national junior college student government conference ever to be held in the United States. At this conference the program would become the Center itself, and three days would be spent in intensive workshops with junior college students to develop the Assistance Center. This conference is scheduled for August 16 - 19, 1969, directly preceding the National Student Congress. Besides giving further direction to the Assistance Center, a national advisory board is envisioned which will be entirely composed of members of the junior college community to actively assist and advise the center in its first year of operation.

Following the conference, the staff would then begin to adapt existing programs and existing information for use by the two year college. This process will continue throughout the year. It will involve extensive meetings with the NSA

staff to orient them to the needs of the junior college.

Work will have commenced on new publications and information, which will be made available to member student governments at nominal charge. Utilizing information presently within NSA, and adding new information, these will be established within the Center a Junior College Government Information Service, which will send material, on loan, to member schools. This information will cover a broad number of topics of concern to community college student government. The Service will provide a stable and centralized focus from which a student can gain assistance on specific problems of his own campus.

Publications coupled with information on loan will serve a primary need of the community college student government. This will provide the junior college student with information on what others have done in a similar situation, what others are doing and suggestions and proposals on what programs might be attempted.

The Center will, as a result of existing contacts and new contacts (resulting from the National Conference) prepare a mailing list. The individuals on that list will receive a periodic newsletter informing them of new developments in two-year institutions. This newsletter should be sent on a monthly basis. This list - the first of its kind - will be of considerable value to many organizations which have, or will develop, an interest in community college students.

The Center should begin to assemble and collect information of junior colleges for student use. This list should include information on academic policies, student life, and governance policies, and college social concerns. Information presently exists through the AAJC and other agencies which could be publicized by the Center, or copies of those publications can be sent on loan. In addition, models should be developed on governance, freshman orientation,

student course and teacher evaluation, programs directed toward the commuting student, and policies on academic rights and responsibilities, to name a few.

One of the primary problems facing the two year college student government is the time that their constituents have available for extra-curricular activities. A great deal has to be done to discover ways that some two year colleges have dealt with this problem, and to formulate new approaches to it. This would be a primary emphasis of the Center during the year.

Due to the massive nature of the problem, we suggest that six schools be selected as "special-emphasis" institutions. These student associations would serve as models, as well as centers for information within a certain geographical area. The resources of the Center, once these schools were selected and identified, would be directed in a special effort to those student associations for the first six to eight months. Extensive consultations and campus visits, both by the Center staff and the NSA staff, would occur during that period. They would then hopefully become focal points for model programs and services, which would be utilized by other schools. By May, 1970, reports would be prepared by the Center and the local student government on the individual progress at each institution. These "demonstration centers" and their resulting experiences could prove to have a serious impact on schools throughout the nation. The only appropriation to the school student government would be limited compensation to the local coordinator, who would work closely with the national office.

After selection, a staff member of the Center would, with the student government leaders, have an extensive and specific discussion on the areas of concern of that particular school. An outline of those needs would then be made into a list of priorities in which the resources of both the student association and the Center would be directed during the following 6-8 months. As will be

later explained, the work within these "demonstration centers" will act as a basis for both the formulation of models, and as the "experience format" of the junior college seminars.

II. Information and Program Exchange

As presently noted, the experience and progress of the demonstration centers will become the basis for the Seminars. We propose that 4 seminars be held, one each in the Northeast, the Midwest, the West, and the South, during this coming year. Attendance will be limited to junior college student leaders and resource individuals.

The seminars will be strictly limited to no more than 100 students, with no single school sending more than two representatives. The meetings will last 3 full days, with special emphasis on leadership training and sensitizing individuals to the problems of their constituency, and the development of programs to meet those problems. With only occasional exception, the resource people will be individuals from "demonstration centers," whose experience by that time will be extensive enough to share with other junior college student leaders. The conference will emphasize small group discussions and workshops for primary skill building. They will be product-oriented, and will refine and develop models and programs for themselves with the Center's assistance. Material from the Junior College Student Government Information Service will be available to the participants. Individuals consultations will be scheduled with resource people and staff members. Whenever possible, the Seminar will be held on a junior college campus, with registration fees kept to a minimum. One of the results of the seminars would be the creation of a network of "task forces" on specific programs, in a certain geographical area, such as a state.

In addition to these seminars, junior college students will be encouraged

to attend NSA substantive conferences during the school year. This will afford the two year institution the much needed opportunity to interact with student governments at the four year institutions. Important state and regional contacts for further assistance and exchange can be made at these conferences, to the benefit of both groups.

The Center will also actively work to improve and assist existing state associations fo community college students, both in program and in conference planning. Therefore, the Center will be available to provide information for these state associations in meeting their own membership needs.

The Center will continue throughout the year to have good rapport and communication with the American Association of Junior Colleges and related professional and educational organizations. NSA envisions a frequent and friendly relationship of cooperation and exchange of information.. The Center will, in addition, work to encourage associations - such as the American Civil Liberties Union - to take a more extensive interest in the two year student.

The conclusion of the first year program will be a Second Annual Conference for community and junior college student governments in the summer of 1970. The three or four day conference will be devoted to workshops and seminars utilizing and disseminating the information gathered and developed during the year. It will involve competent resource individuals, professional and student, in the junior college field. The results of that conference, while it is difficult to be certain, could be the establishment of a continuing and perhaps even separate national association of community college students, supported entirely by specific project grants, services, and membership fees.

Therefore, the object of this proposal, aside form those already mentioned, is an intensive program year with two year college student governments so that

at the conclusion of that year, junior college students themselves will press for a national identity and program to meet their significant needs and conerns. The resources of the center, built up during the year, would then be transferred to them.